

### **Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-18 are pending and claims 1-18 stand rejected. In response to the office action dated June 27, 2008, the claim amendments and following comments are submitted and reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. §103**

Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-14 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior art in view of Proctor, Jr. et al (US 6,941,152). As cited in the description, admitted prior art teaches (page 2 lines 25-27):

" Currently in a wireless communication network, each station of the network makes use of omnidirectional antenna for dispatching all the types of frames."

The different types of frames are described in the paragraph page 2 lines 5-24. there are multi-receiver frames (RTS and CTS) and mono-receiver frames (DATA, ACK). Thus, in the admitted prior art, mono-receiver frames and multi-receiver frames are only dispatched by omnidirectional antennas. The aim of the present invention is to improve the communications in a wireless communication network by increasing the throughput of the network (description on page 4 lines 1-3).

From Proctor.Jr et al. (US Patent 6 941 152) it is known that the subscriber access unit 14a is connected to an omnidirectional antenna 22 and that the subscriber access unit 14b is connected to a directional antenna.(col 3 lines 27-29). Furthermore it is disclosed that the subscriber access unit 14b, connected to a directional antenna, allows higher throughput (col 5 lines 20-33). But Proctor.Jr et al. does not disclose that a subscriber access unit is connected to both an omnidirectional antenna and a directional antenna and can dispatch in an omnidirectional manner using an omnidirectional antenna or in a directional manner using a directional antenna. Thus the method disclosed in claim 1 concerning a method of communication between stations which are effected by transfer of different frames in an omnidirectional manner using an omnidirectional antenna or in a directional manner using a directional antenna with a better throughput for each frame, is not known from the cited documents.

The present invention concerns a method of communication for which each station of the network is equipped with an omnidirectional antenna **and** with one or more directional antennas for the transmission of different frames in both omnidirectional and directional ways.

Applicant's amendment of claim 1 recites that the omnidirectional manner corresponds to the use of an omnidirectional antenna, and that the directional manner corresponds to the use of a directional antenna and is based on the description on page 6 line 26 to page 7 line 7. Neither admitted prior art nor Proctor, Jr et al suggest, either singly or together, a method of communication in transmitting/receiving stations in a wireless communication network, in which first multi-receiver frames are exchanged between a station and a plurality of other stations indicating the transmitting station and the receiving station in an omnidirectional manner using an omnidirectional antenna and second mono-receiver frames are exchanged between the transmitting station and a receiving station, in a directional manner using a directional antenna, wherein the transmission in an omnidirectional manner is effected in a more robust fashion than the transmission in a directional manner using a directional antenna. With the amendment, rejection of claim 1 is believed to be traversed. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, being properly dependent on base claims that are believed to be allowable, are themselves allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 – 8 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 9, the applicant recognizes that the admitted prior art discloses that the data are transferred in an omnidirectional manner or in a directional manner. But, the admitted prior art teaches that each station uses omnidirectional antennas for dispatching all the types of frames. Thus the admitted prior art does not teach that the station comprises both omnidirectional and directional antennas to transmit in an omnidirectional manner and directional manner respectively (page 2 lines 25-27). Amended claim 9 recites "an omnidirectional antenna" and "one or more directional antennas", replacing "means" and "means to", respectively. Thus claim 9 relates to a station comprising, inter alia, an omnidirectional antenna to transmit and receive multi-

receiver frames in an omnidirectional manner indicating the transmitting and the receiving station and one or more directional antennas to transmit and receive mono-receiver frames in a directional manner. This is not known from the admitted prior art.

Proctor.Jr et al. discloses that a subscriber access unit is connected to an omnidirectional antenna or to a directional antenna but does not disclose a station as claimed in claim 9 which comprises both an omnidirectional antenna and at least one directional antenna.

Neither admitted prior art nor Proctor.Jr et al suggest, either singly or together, a transmitting and receiving station for a wireless communication network, wherein said station comprises an omnidirectional antenna to transmit and receive multi-receiver frames in an omnidirectional manner indicating the transmitting and the receiving station and one or more directional antennas to transmit and receive mono-receiver frames in a directional manner, determined by the first multi-receiver frames, the transmission in an omnidirectional manner being effected in a more robust fashion than the transmission in a directional manner as recited in claim 9. Claim 9 is thus considered to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 – 14, 16 and 17 and have been cancelled. Claims 15 and 18, being properly dependent on base claims that are believed to be allowable, are themselves allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 18 is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (386) 438-8034, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,  
PATRICK FONTAINE et al

By: /Catherine A. Ferguson/

Catherine A. Ferguson

Reg. No. 40,877

Phone (609)734-6440

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
October 6, 2008